

APPEAL NO. 040711  
FILED MAY 24, 2004

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing (CCH) was held on March 5, 2004. The hearing officer resolved the disputed issue by deciding that the appellant/cross-respondent's (claimant) compensable injury of \_\_\_\_\_, includes an injury to both shoulders and her head, but not her lumbar spine, left foot, or bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS). The claimant appealed the determination that the compensable injury did not include her lumbar spine, left foot, or bilateral CTS. The claimant attached numerous documents to her appeal, some of which were admitted at the CCH, some of which were excluded at the CCH, and some of which were new evidence not offered at the CCH. The respondent/cross-appellant (carrier) responded, urging affirmance. The carrier also filed an appeal, disputing the determination that the compensable injury included the claimant's head and both shoulders. The appeal file did not contain a response from the claimant.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The claimant attached documents to her appeal, some of which were not admitted into evidence at the hearing. Documents submitted for the first time on appeal are generally not considered unless they constitute newly discovered evidence. See *generally* Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93111, decided March 29, 1993; Black v. Wills, 758 S.W.2d 809 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1988, no writ). In determining whether new evidence submitted with an appeal requires remand for further consideration, the Appeals Panel considers whether the evidence came to the knowledge of the party after the hearing, whether it is cumulative of other evidence of record, whether it was not offered at the hearing due to a lack of diligence, and whether it is so material that it would probably result in a different decision. See Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93536, decided August 12, 1993. Upon our review, we cannot agree that the evidence meets the requirements of newly discovered evidence, in that the claimant did not show that the new evidence submitted for the first time on appeal could not have been obtained prior to the hearing or that its inclusion in the record would probably result in a different decision. The evidence, therefore, does not meet the standard for newly discovered evidence and will not be considered.

The claimant additionally attached exhibits to her appeal which were specifically excluded at the CCH. The claimant argues in her appeal that the evidence should have been admitted and considered by the hearing officer in reaching his determination. The evidence was excluded because the hearing officer found that it was not timely exchanged and that there was no good cause for such failure to timely exchange the documents being offered into evidence. To obtain a reversal on the basis of admission or exclusion of evidence, it must be shown that the ruling admitting or excluding the

evidence was in error and that the error was reasonably calculated to cause and probably did cause rendition of an improper judgment. Hernandez v. Hernandez, 611 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. Civ. App.-San Antonio 1981, no writ). It has also been stated that reversible error is not ordinarily shown in connection with rulings on questions of evidence unless the whole case turns on the particular evidence admitted or excluded. Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company v. Middleman, 661 S.W.2d 182 (Tex. App.-San Antonio 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.). We conclude that the claimant has not shown that the error, if any, in the exclusion of the claimant's evidence amounted to reversible error.

The issue of extent of injury presents a question of fact. Section 410.165(a) provides that the hearing officer, as finder of fact, is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence as well as of the weight and credibility that is to be given to the evidence. It was for the hearing officer, as trier of fact, to resolve the inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701, 702 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). This is equally true regarding medical evidence. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286, 290 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). The trier of fact may believe all, part, or none of the testimony of any witness. Taylor v. Lewis, 553 S.W.2d 153, 161 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Aetna Insurance Co. v. English, 204 S.W.2d 850 (Tex. Civ. App.-Fort Worth 1947, no writ). An appeals-level body is not a fact finder and does not normally pass upon the credibility of witnesses or substitute its own judgment for that of the trier of fact, even if the evidence would support a different result. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania v. Soto, 819 S.W.2d 619, 620 (Tex. App.-El Paso 1991, writ denied). When reviewing a hearing officer's decision for factual sufficiency of the evidence we should reverse such decision only if it is so contrary to the overwhelming weight of the evidence as to be clearly wrong and unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986); Pool v. Ford Motor Co., 715 S.W.2d 629, 635 (Tex. 1986). Applying this standard, we find sufficient evidence in the record to support the hearing officer's resolution of the issue.

We affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **LIBERTY INSURANCE CORPORATION** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**CT CORPORATION SYSTEMS  
350 NORTH ST. PAUL, SUITE 2900  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.**

---

Margaret L. Turner  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Elaine M. Chaney  
Appeals Judge

---

Robert W. Potts  
Appeals Judge